

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

15267

In discussions with European engineers and fishery biologists, I had the impression they felt Americans generally assume a monopoly of know-how in this complex field. I never heard of any European expert being called in by an American agency to help design fish passage facilities. Such experts are available in Scotland, Ireland, and elsewhere, and are willing to come and help us. Perhaps this is the time to avail ourselves of this knowledge.

Although I did not visit any powerplants in Russia, I was interested to find in the excellent report by the U.S. Senate committees which visited Russia a few years ago that they observed considerable progress in passing fish over dams. For instance, the committee saw at Stalingrad (now Volgograd) Dam on the Volga's main stem, "a fish elevator and unique fish locks under construction. * * * The elevator will be approximately in the center of the main structure. The fish locks are actually the navigation locks. * * * The chief design engineer * * * (said) * * * this is the first time they are trying to get the fish and boats into the same lock. He said they plan to attract the fish to the two parallel locks by a current of water. * * * Fish can be taken both upstream and downstream by this device."

The committee actually saw a fish elevator in operation, at Tsimlyanskaya Dam on the Don River. Dimensions of the elevator were 15 by 21 by 105 feet. It could lift a ton of fish at a time. During the peak season, July and August, the lift completed one cycle every 1½ to 2 hours. Here, too, the fish are attracted to the elevator by a current of water, then moved by net to the tank, which is lifted to the level of the reservoir above the dam—where they swim free.

I was surprised, by the way, to learn from the Committee's report that the cost of the fish lock at the huge Stalingrad Dam was estimated as only 1 percent of the total cost of the project. You may contrast this with the \$260 million which the Fish and Wildlife Service estimates as the cost of fish facilities at Rampart—or 25 percent of the total.

It is logical to conclude that we can learn some things from the Russians as well as from the Scotch and Irish about handling salmon runs at dams—and perhaps save money too. European engineers generally think that sometimes American engineers like to do things the most expensive way, not the most economical or practical way.

The Swedes have shown the world that it is possible with the use of imagination and scientific knowledge, to have fish and power too.

Sweden has no oil or large deposits of coal. Its predominant sources of energy are the lovely, rapid-strewn rivers that flow into the Baltic Sea. Nearly every one of these streams once had rich stocks of salmon. Now, many of them have been dammed for hydro generation, yet total salmon production from the Swedish rivers has been maintained. What is the secret behind this impressive achievement?

After World War II, when Sweden launched a program of intensive river development, which necessarily affected the valuable salmon fisheries, the decision was made not to attempt to maintain natural runs but to rely instead on artificial production. This avoided the necessity of expensive fish ladders or locks, and led to the perfection of the art of salmon rearing on a large scale.

The impetus behind this decision was not so much economic, since it is quite expensive to rear salmon in hatcheries, but was the directive of the Swedish Water Courts under the water law of 1923; namely, that the company or agency building the powerplants must not only pay the owners for loss of fishing rights but replace the natural runs in the river from artificial production. In fact, the Water Courts determine the num-

ber of smolts (young salmon) that must be released into every stream blocked by a dam.

There are now 15 salmon hatcheries in Sweden; more modern in some respects than any in the United States. Last year they produced over 1 million smolts. The target is 1,500,000 smolts by 1970. If this goal is reached, and the biologists are confident of reaching it, about half of all Swedish salmon will be artificially bred. Hundreds of thousands of smolts, which are only a few inches long, are trucked as much as 500 miles from the rearing stations for release in far northern rivers. Here is an idea that might be used on the Yukon.

Proof of the pudding is in the eating. Proof of the success of Sweden's artificial fish propagation is that the salmon catch in the estuaries of the Swedish rivers and on their feeding grounds in the southern Baltic has been on a plateau in recent years, while salmon populations in this part of the world generally are in a down cycle which lasts from 8 to 11 years. Ironically, the Swedish program has helped the Danish fishermen (who take some 60 percent of the Baltic catch) more than the Swedish fishermen.

I have gone into detail about the Swedish experience because it shows that the prophets of gloom and doom about the possible impact of a high dam like Rampart on the salmon runs ignore many facts. The scale is smaller, of course, than in our North Pacific river systems, but the principles and procedures are valid and offer something for us. Artificial production as the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service admits, might save the upstream spawning Yukon salmon if other means prove impractical or unsuccessful.

I would like to point out another fallacy in the Federal Government's report on the Yukon fisheries: its assertion that anadromous fish would not survive in the vast reservoir or lake created by the Rampart Dam. The Columbia River is now virtually a series of lakes from Bonneville to Grand Coulee, yet the salmon are still there, even if their numbers are reduced—for as yet not clearly determined reasons.

On the whole, it seems to me that such studies as those published which have been by Federal agencies to date are not only unduly pessimistic, so far as the fisheries are concerned, but at times read more like propaganda designed to kill the Rampart proposal than scientific and objective investigations. In fact, no real research was conducted by fishery agencies along the Yukon until 1955. Only in 1961 and 1962 were investigations that could be related to the management of the Yukon fisheries started by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries at river mile 756, and by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game at the mouth of the river. As of now, knowledge of salmon spawning in the interior of Alaska and Yukon territory is quite sketchy.

What is urgently needed are research and planning in depth—on all the nonpower resources of the river basin. It should be carried on while preliminary engineering on the Rampart project is going forward. Such a program was conducted in planning the John Day project on the Columbia River and resulted in a satisfactory program for handling the wildlife and fishery resources affected by the dam.

Research and planning for the best development of the Yukon should be international in scope, taking advantage of experiments and experience in other parts of the world. It should be approached from a co-operative point of view, with consideration of the multiple purposes and benefits of river development. So far, scarcely a start has been made in this direction except the Development and Resources Corp. report on the power potential of the Yukon. We can no longer afford to solve natural resource problems by means of divided jurisdiction, by the play of vested interests.

I hope you will take my remarks as those of an outsider who is vitally interested in the progress of the State of Alaska, and who would like to see—for once—all those interested in the great and varied resources of your rivers bury their hatchets and work together for the greatest good of the greatest number of people. Thank you.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session for the purpose of considering a nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

CIRCUIT JUDGE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I submit a report of the Committee on the Judiciary recommending that the nomination of Abraham L. Freedman of Pennsylvania to be U.S. circuit judge, third circuit, vice Herbert F. Goodrich, deceased, be confirmed forthwith.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I acted as chairman at the hearing at which the nomination of Abraham L. Freedman to be U.S. circuit judge for the third circuit was considered. Mr. Freedman is well qualified for the position. All the witnesses so testified. They included both Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK and Mr. SCOTT]. The State bar sent to us their approval of the nomination.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it is a very happy day in my life to be able to participate in the brief proceedings confirming the nomination of Judge Abraham L. Freedman, who is presently judge of the district court for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, to be a judge of the Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

Judge Freedman is eminently qualified for this position, as the record will amply show. In addition, he happens to be an old personal friend of mine. It is rare indeed that those two qualifications coincide.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, in the interest of brevity, I shall not repeat what I have said for the record before the Committee on the Judiciary, sitting with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], this morning, but there is no question that Judge Freedman is eminently qualified and has been certified by the American Bar Association as exceptionally well qualified, which is the summa cum laude award of our profession.

I am most happy to move to proceed with the request that the nomination be concurred in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Judge Abraham L. Freedman to be U.S. circuit judge, third circuit, vice Herbert F. Goodrich, deceased, the nomination is confirmed.

15268

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 2

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

GEN. MAXWELL D. TAYLOR, AMBASSADOR TO REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I take the floor for only a moment to express my gratification at the unanimous confirmation of the nomination of the distinguished Chief of Staff of the Army, Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary from the United States to the Republic of Vietnam.

General Taylor has won distinction in many phases of military life. He distinguished himself as a wonderful educator when he was head of the West Point Academy. He was an active leader in the Department of Paratroop Divisions during World War II. He had a heroic distinguished military career both in World War II and in Korea, and later as Chief of Staff of the Army. He was an outstanding military man in that field.

It is significant that he had the courage to resign his appointment as Chief of Staff of the Army under the previous administration when it was impossible to secure the appropriations which he felt were necessary to modernize the Army, including its airlift, its transport, its weapon systems, and other things vital to making America secure. The record is well known to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Since his appointment by the late President Kennedy he has raised American military standards, military equipment, and our military power many times.

Mr. President, General Taylor is not only a great military genius, but also he is a man of great accomplishments in the same pattern as that of the late Gen. George C. Marshall. General Taylor is also a statesman of the first order. His appointment and his willingness gladly to accept the roughest and toughest ambassadorial post marks him to the same degree that General Marshall was marked in accepting an appointment by President Truman in the Asian theater during the close of World War II.

I wish General Taylor the best of luck. I am happy to see that the Senate has unanimously confirmed the nomination of General Taylor to this very important task that lies ahead.

DIGNITY OF MAN AND WORTH OF THE INDIVIDUAL

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, 18 years ago in San Francisco, the Soviet Union and the United States were signatories to a rather unique and hopeful document—the Charter of the United Nations. We pledged ourselves, among other goals, to “reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person.” The United States and the Soviet Union adopted as a common purpose the promotion of universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

These United States were founded upon a real and basic awareness of the dignity of man and the worth of the individual. I believe our history shows that, before this charter embodied the hopes of men around the world, we have conscientiously worked toward the reduction of discrimination, the guarantee of individual rights and respect for human dignity. We have known times and instances of discrimination—ignorance—prejudice—directed at various groups because of religious beliefs or because of the color of their skin. But most of it has been overcome and we are working on the problems that remain. This is important. We are working on our own internal problems.

Our fellow signator, the Soviet Union, has time and time again during the past decades aired and condemned the strife and controversy engendered by our racial differences. But, Mr. President, while we have acted to solve our problems, what has happened in the Soviet Union?

The people of Russia have been through the ages a deeply religious people and communism did not change that. However, communism is changing that today. Priests and rabbis have died and have not been replaced. Great cathedrals are now museums to Russia's material and technological progress. The Jewish, Protestant, Catholic and Orthodox faiths all have new rosters of martyrs.

Because I know my colleagues are well aware of how such fundamental rights are nurtured and protected in the Soviet Union, I shall not review in detail, for example, the numerous casts of anti-Judaism so frequently reported in our newspapers. A few items will suffice. Yeshivahs have been closed. One remains open in Moscow, but there is only one seminary there. Out of 3,000 synagogues in 1917, when the czar was overthrown, less than 80 remain today. For the alleged economic offense of baking matzoh at Passover, Jews are imprisoned or executed. The internationally respected Jewish schools, theaters, magazines, and other institutions—where are they now?

Our Judeo-Christian heritage is the cornerstone for our civilization's recognition of the God-given dignity of man and the true worth of the individual—

and this, in turn, is in direct opposition to the cornerstone of communism as practiced in the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, I recognized that this persecution of the Jewish people is an internal problem as far as the Soviet Union is concerned and a formal protest might well endanger those who must continue to work out their existence in the shadow of the Kremlin. However, I also feel very strongly that all of us must, as a personal declaration of conscience, stand up and protest against this smothering of Jewish religion, heritage, and culture in the Soviet Union.

Since our nations signed the Charter of the United Nations, the Soviet Union has taken great pride in challenging the United States around the globe through military pacts, through economic aid programs, through space shots, through nuclear stockpiles, through every weapon in the diplomatic stockpile.

Mr. President, I now challenge the Soviet Union to match our progress in the field of human rights.

ACTIVE-DUTY TRAINING FOR NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, at this time of year thousands of our Nation's men and women undergo a brief but drastic change in their lives.

One day they are going about their normal work and family living. The next day they are in uniform and on military maneuvers.

In short, the period of active-duty training for members of the National Guard and Reserve forces is upon us. I know that Delaware units, for instance, are training near the Atlantic coast below Bethany Beach. But they are not going there for a vacation. Their program is intensive. In order to keep the units in first-rate readiness, it is necessary to take full advantage of the summertime training.

A member of the National Guard or the Reserve forces is truly “twice a citizen.” An integral part of his civilian community, he is at the same time a vital part of the Nation's armed might.

His is a proud heritage. It goes back to the earliest days of our country, when able-bodied citizens recognized the privilege and responsibility of being ready at all times to bear arms for the common defense.

Gen. George Washington underlined this principle of military service in speaking to the First Continental Congress.

Every citizen who enjoys the protection of a free government—

He said—
owes not only a portion of his property but even of his personal services to the defense of it.

The various colonies organized militia bands, and later the framers of the Constitution recognized the importance of these forces by empowering the Congress to “provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia.”